

Independent Evaluation and Audit Services (IEAS)
UN WOMEN Global Evaluation Quality Assessment and Rating



| Rating Scale | Very Good | Good | Fair | Unsatisfactory | Reviewer Guidance : |
|-----------------------------|--|---|---|---|--|
| Rating explanation | The report can be used with high level of confidence and is considered a good example. | The report can be used with certain degree of confidence. | Partially meets requirements with some missing elements. The report can be used with caution. | Misses out the minimum quality standards. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Overall reports are rated against a four-point scale (Very Good, Good, Fair and Unsatisfactory), which is an aggregated rating of eight parameters. - Each overarching parameter is rated against a four-point scale (Fully, Mostly, Partially and Not at all). - Parameters such as evaluation methodology, findings, conclusions and recommendations are given more weight. - Executive feedback - provide summary of the extent to which the report meets or fails to meet the criteria provided under each parameter. Please also include suggestions on how to improve future evaluation practice. The overall review, rating and executive feedback will be provided to the evaluation commissioning office. |
| Parameter Weight (%) | 1: Object and context 2: Purpose, objectives and scope 3: Methodology 4: Findings 9: Disability Inclusion (bonus points) | 5 5 15 20 5 | 5: Conclusions and lessons learned 6: Recommendations 7: Gender Equality and Human Rights (UN-SWAP) 8: Report presentation | 20 15 10 10 | <p><i>Are weightings equal to 100% (excluding a DI criteria)?</i></p> <p>OK</p> |

PART I: REPORT DETAILS

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------|
| Report title | Support Project for the Development of Micro, Small and Medium-sized Enterprises, « PADMPME » Project/Programme | | | Geographical Coverage | National |
| Sequence number | 2 | Evaluators | [Female] ; [Male] | Year | 2025 |
| Region | Western and Central Africa | Country(ies) | Democratic Republic of Congo | Type of intervention evaluated | Project |
| Portfolio Budget (USD) | | Evaluation Budget (USD) | | Reviewer | C. Marcondes |
| Strategic Plan Thematic Area (select all that apply) | Women's access to | | | Review Date | 29 May 2025 |

PART II: THE EIGHT KEY PARAMETERS

SECTION 1: OBJECT AND CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION (weight 5%)

RATING

Good

Does the report present a clear and full description of the 'object' of the evaluation?

58%

Executive Feedback on Section 1

1.1 The report clearly specifies the **object** of the evaluation, and provides a clear and complete description of the intervention's original logic (e.g. expected results chain or theory of change), timeframe, intended beneficiaries by type, geographic location(s) as well as the planned budget of the intervention.

Partly

The project description is incomplete. It should have contained detailed information about each of the components (as opposed to description of only one sub-component), along with a description of the key activities (in addition to the description of the products), as well as their location. In addition to the Theory of Change, a description of the results chain or a logic model, should have been included. The context is clearly explained with details about the factors with direct bearing on the evaluation object. Information on the key stakeholders is included but more details should have been included to provide the reader with a complete overview of the project. Some information about project implementation timeframe should have also been included.

Note: Please address all aspects of this sub-criteria. If the project did not have a ToC, clearly outline the expected results of the intervention and how the activities were expected to lead to the results.

1.2 The **context** includes factors that have a direct bearing on the object of the evaluation: social, political, economic, demographic and institutional. This also includes explanation of the contextual gender equality and human rights issues, roles, attitudes and relations.

Fully

Note: This section should be concise but sufficient to cover key contextual issue.

1.3 The **key stakeholders** involved in the implementation, including the implementing agency(ies) and partners, other stakeholders and their roles are described.

Mostly

Note: Remember to include not only a list of partners but also a description of their main activities and/or the role they had in the implementation of the intervention in the body of report. Detailed description and stakeholder analysis can be provided in annexes.

1.4 The report identifies any changes in the **timeframe and/or implementation plans** (e.g. original plans, strategies, logical frameworks), provides an explanation for these and for any implications these may have had regarding the evaluation.

Partly

Note: Remember to identify the implementation status of the object, including its phase of implementation and any significant changes.

SECTION 2: PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)

RATING

Very Good

Are the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope sufficiently clear to guide the evaluation?

100%

Executive Feedback on Section 2

2.1 **Purpose, objectives and use of evaluation:** The evaluation report provides a clear explanation of the purpose and the objectives of the evaluation, including the intended use and users of the evaluation and how the information will be used.

Fully

The purpose, objectives, use of evaluation are clearly outlined. The scope is also well described.

2.2 **Evaluation Scope:** The evaluation report provides a clear description of the scope of the evaluation, including a description of the timeframe and outputs/outcomes covered, and not covered (thematically, geographically etc.) as well as the reasons for this scope (e.g. specifications by the ToR, lack of access to particular geographic areas for political or safety reasons at the time of the evaluation, lack of data/evidence on particular elements of the intervention).

Fully

SECTION 3 : METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)

RATING

Good

Is the methodology used for the evaluation clearly described and appropriate, and the rationale for the methodological choice justified?

57%

Executive Feedback on Section 3

3.1 **Methodology:** The report provides a complete description of the methods used for data collection and analysis, the chosen evaluation criteria and evaluation questions, and demonstrate that the methods chosen are appropriate to inform the responses to the criteria and questions.

Mostly

Note: An evaluation matrix containing the evaluation questions in each evaluation criteria, the indicators, the data sources and methods for data collection is useful to show these, but it is still important to include some explanations in the body of the document to clearly demonstrate that the methods are appropriate for triangulation. Remember to keep this section succinct and use annexes to provide detailed information.

The methodology is well explained (although there are some inconsistencies such as references to 5 methods of data collection but explanations about only 3). These ratings also considered the information in the Annex. The information provided shows that the methods were appropriate to provide responses to evaluation questions with general information on the sampling strategy, stakeholder mapping and participation, the various data collection methods. The methods seem appropriate for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE/HR specific results and the evaluation matrix (Annex) helps to

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| <p>3.2 Data collection, analysis and sampling: The report clearly describes the tools used for data collection and the rationale for their selection as well as the sampling strategy and methods used for data analysis. The report includes discussion of how the mix of data sources was used to obtain a diversity of perspectives, to guide the assessments of GE/HR specific results and to ensure data accuracy and completeness.</p> <p><i>Note: Please describe not only the types of data collection tools used (e.g. surveys, KIIs, desk review) but also how the data was collected (where, when, who, how) and what steps were taken to analyze it. Remember to include a description of original sampling strategy and the extent to which it covers the range of stakeholders involved in the intervention, with a clear justification of the selection of the targeted sample. Use annexes to provide detailed description.</i></p> | Partly | <p>show triangulation. Details about each line of evidence are included along with general references to their rationale but more information about the extent in which the final sample provided for representativity of all project elements should have been included. The process of analysis should have been described along with more details about the activities undertaken for the consultations. References to adherence to ethics and specific evaluation standards are also included. Limitations are described but more information about the implications they had in the evaluation should have been included.</p> |
| <p>3.3 Stakeholders Consultation: The evaluation report gives a complete description of the stakeholder consultation process in the evaluation, including the rationale for selecting the particular level and activities for consultation.</p> <p><i>Note: Include a stakeholder mapping, showing that the consultation process was comprehensive to assure the reader that the selection of KIIs and/or survey participants was appropriate and representative of the universe of project stakeholder (in line with descriptions under item 1.3 above). Use annexes to provide detailed description.</i></p> | Mostly | |
| <p>3.4 Limitations: The report presents a clear and complete description of limitations and constraints faced by the evaluation and if/how these were mitigated (e.g. gaps in the evidence, biases due to limits in stakeholder consultations, etc.).</p> | Mostly | |
| <p>3.5 Ethics: The evaluation report makes explicit references to the ethical obligations of the evaluators and shows evidence that data collection and tools adhered to these ethical principles, (e.g. mechanisms and measures were implemented to ensure that the evaluation process conformed to relevant ethical standards, including but not limited to, informed consent of participants, confidentiality and avoidance of harm considerations).</p> <p><i>Note: Mentioning/referencing UNEG standards in the report does not amount to sufficient evidence that the data was actually collected with sensitivity to ethics and discrimination. It is a good practice to provide a clear explanation as to how the evaluation adopted these, showing examples of tools and processes used were sensitive to ethical considerations (e.g. consent, confidentiality) and were not discriminatory against particular group's participation (i.e. were interviews or focus groups held in a location, at a time, in a setting, using language/translation, that is appropriate and respectful; and facilitates the participation of a full range of stakeholders). Use annexes to provide detailed description.</i></p> | Fully | |

| SECTION 4: FINDINGS (weight 20%) | Rating | Fair |
|--|--------|---|
| Are the findings well substantiated, clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence? | 43% | Executive Feedback on Section 4 |
| 4.1 Findings are presented with clarity, logic and coherence (e.g. avoid ambiguities). <i>Note: It is a good practice to clearly outline the findings in the report, preferably using a "set" of findings statements, with clear articulation and conciseness, followed by substantiation and full demonstration of the evidence used to formulate the findings' statements.</i> | Partly | The Findings section does not contains sets of "findings statements" in response to the evaluation questions/criteria. Even though the report draws preliminary "conclusions" in some evaluation criteria (e.g. section 5.1.4) , these should have been formulated as more clear and direct responses to the evaluation questions, consistently. The narrative should also have included more details to substantiate the findings, going beyond descriptions but with examples showing how the achievements took place. Data sources are cited often, however, the evidence and sources of data for Table 10 is missing and should have been included. The analysis should have focused on the overarching "criteria" question (e.g. under relevance, the goal is to analyze the extent to which the intervention "design" was appropriate and if the project is doing the "right" things). The ratings take into consideration that the coverage is comprehensive, and organized in line with the evaluation questions. Cause-effects links should also have been more clearly outlined, beyond stating that results were in place. More details and explanations about how the activities were implemented and how their implementation led to the outputs and contributed to the outcomes should also have been included, specially in the Effectiveness section. |
| 4.2 The evaluation findings are well substantiated, and provide sufficient levels of high quality evidence to systematically address the evaluation questions and criteria. <i>Note: Ensure the findings narrative are consistent with the findings statements and fully back the statement, showing the evidence and triangulation clearly.</i> | Mostly | |
| 4.3 Findings reflect systematic and appropriate analysis and interpretation of the data; they are free from subjective judgments. <i>Note: in addition to describing the implementation of activities and completion of outputs, include an analysis of their contributions towards the intervention outcomes.</i> | Partly | |
| 4.4 Are cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended results highlighted? <i>Note: Remember to include information on both the cause/effect links and unintended results</i> | Partly | |
| SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED (weight 20%) | Rating | Good |
| Are the conclusions clearly presented based on findings and substantiated by evidence? | 67% | Executive Feedback on Section 5 |
| 5.1 Conclusions are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings. <i>Note: Conclusions are not summaries of findings but they are formulated from the analysis and interpretation of the findings, giving meaning to them.</i> | Fully | The Conclusions section is also well written, clearly deriving from the findings, however, it should have been broadened to ensure it covers the key aspects highlighted in the recommendations. Conclusions should go beyond the findings with additional analysis pointing to the recommendations, and they should also contain a balance of strenghts and weakness identified (currently skewed towards strenghts). A section on lessons is included but the lessons need to be presented in a more generalized way, showing how they can be applied to different contexts. |
| 5.2 The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments that add insight and analysis beyond the findings. <i>Note: Conclusions should provide explanations for the findings and form the basis for recommending actions or decisions that are consistent with the conclusions.</i> | Partly | |
| 5.3 Conclusions present the strengths and weaknesses of the object (policy, programmes, projects or other intervention) being evaluated, based on the evidence presented and taking due account of the views of a diverse cross-section of stakeholders. | Mostly | |
| 5.4 Lessons Learned: When presented, the lessons learned section stems logically from the findings, presents an analysis of how they can be applied to different contexts and/or different sectors, and takes into account evidential limitations such as gen-eralizing from single point observations. <i>Note: The lessons learned from an evaluation comprise the new knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (initiative, context outcomes and even evaluation methods) that is applicable to and useful in other similar contexts. They should demonstrate the intervention experience and be generalized to enable applicability by other interventions.</i> | Mostly | |
| SECTION 6: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%) | Rating | Good |
| Are the recommendations relevant, useful, actionable and clearly presented in a priority order? | 70% | Executive Feedback on Section 6 |

| | | |
|--|---------------|--|
| <p>6.1 Recommendations are well grounded on the evaluation, logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.</p> <p><i>Note: The recommendations should be complete in number and depth, reflecting the analysis in the findings and conclusions and address the issues identified earlier.</i></p> | <p>Mostly</p> | <p>A good number of good recommendations are included. While they reference the evaluation section on which they are grounded, their rationale is not clearly/directly articulated earlier, in the findings and conclusions sections. They are also presented in a very summarized way and should have contained more details, including action-oriented steps towards their implementation. They should contain guidance towards addressing the issues identified, covering not only "what" should be done but also "how" it should be done. There are references to the process and the recommendations are prioritized.</p> |
| <p>6.2 The report describes the process followed in developing the recommendations including consultation with stakeholders.</p> <p><i>Note: Include a relevant explanation on the extent to which the evaluation participants were specifically consulted for the formulation of the recommendations and/or the level of participation of stakeholders in this evaluation stage.</i></p> | <p>Fully</p> | |
| <p>6.3 Recommendations are clear, realistic (e.g. reflect an understanding of the subject's potential constraints to follow-up) and actionable.</p> | <p>Partly</p> | |
| <p>6.4 Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use.</p> | <p>Fully</p> | |

| SECTION 7: GENDER AND HUMAN RIGHTS (weight 15%) | Score | Approaching Requirements |
|---|-------------------------------|--|
| <p>Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators? Note: this section will be rated according to UN SWAP standards.</p> | 67% | <p>Executive Feedback on Section 7</p> |
| <p>7.1 GEWE is integrated in the evaluation scope of analysis and evaluation criteria and questions are designed in a way that ensures GEWE related data will be collected.</p> <p><i>Note: Refer to the UNEG UN-SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator Technical Note for guidance on this section.</i></p> | Fully integrated (3) | <p>Gender is fully integrated in the evaluation scope. Even though there is no assessment of data on specific gender results, the scope integrates gender as a criterion and evaluation questions related to gender/HR are included. Methodology was partially gender responsive since the methodology uses mixed data collection methods and contains references to the use of confidentiality. However, detailed information about gender-responsive tools used for data collection/analysis were not specifically referenced and there are no detailed information about the sampling frame or strategy, or references to focus on targeting women as Key Informants. The data collection methods are generally appropriate for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE and HR specific results. Also, references are included regarding adherence to ethics or specific evaluation standards during the evaluation design and conduct. The project topic is "Gender", and as such there are references to it throughout the report, even though there are gaps related to the analysis (as mentioned above under Findings). The Gender section is limited to referencing the incorporation of gender in the project at high level even though there is limited substantiation. Background section contains good syntheses of the gender problematic to be addressed. Unanticipated effects were not clearly identified. GEEW aspects are also included in the conclusions and recommendations.</p> |
| <p>7.2 A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.</p> <p><i>Note: it is not enough to simply describe the methodology as "gender-responsive", it is important to demonstrate that the data collection and analysis integrated gender considerations; that data was collected disaggregated by sex; that methods/tools were designed to enable GEWE assessments; and/or that processes employed (i.e. sampling, triangulation, validation) ensured inclusion and enabled data for GEWE analysis</i></p> | Partially integrated (1) | |
| <p>7.3 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation reflect a gender analysis.</p> <p><i>Note: Please address all aspects of this sub-criterion.</i></p> | Satisfactorily integrated (2) | |
| <p>SECTION 8: THE REPORT PRESENTATION (weight 10%)</p> | Rating | Good |
| <p>Is the report well structured, written in accessible language and well presented?</p> | 57% | <p>Executive Feedback on Section 8</p> |
| <p>8.1 Report is logically structured, concise and of reasonable length, well written and presented with clarity and coherence (e.g. the structure and presentation is easy to identify and navigate (numbered sections, clear titles and subtitles, context, purpose and methodology would normally precede findings, which would normally be followed by conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations) and is written in accessible language with minimal grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors.</p> <p><i>Note: Reasonable length for project/programme and CPE evaluations is about 40 pages (excluding Annexes 60 pages); and 50 pages for institutional and thematic evaluations (excluding Annexes 60 pages).</i></p> | Partly | <p>Report is complete and contains appropriate structure. It is slightly long and should have been shortened to about 40 pages (currently about 50 pages). Most key annexes are included but the list of people interviewed is really important and is missing. The report contains proper headings but the numbering of the paragraphs and the use of point form in the findings section, and the formatting, made up of various boxes and different colours describing the narrative can be confusing for the reader. Also, footnotes should have been placed either at the bottom of the page or at the end of the document. The first few pages are complete. The executive summary is missing a section on "conclusions" to be considered a fully stand-alone section.</p> |
| <p>8.2 The title page and opening pages provide key basic information on the name of evaluators and, timeframe of the evaluation, date of report, location of evaluated object, names and/or organization(s) of the evaluator(s), name of organization commissioning the evaluation, table of contents including, as relevant: tables, graphs, figures, annexes-; list of acronyms/abbreviations, page numbers.</p> | Fully | |
| <p>8.3 The Executive Summary is a stand-alone section that includes an overview of the intervention, evaluation purpose, objectives and intended audience, evaluation methodology, key findings, conclusions and recommendations. The Executive summary should be reasonably concise.</p> <p><i>Note: Executive Summaries should be maximum 5-6 pages long</i></p> | Mostly | |
| <p>8.4 Annexes should be of reasonable length and include, when not present in the body of the report: ToR, evaluation matrix, list of interviewees, list of site visits, data collection instruments (such as survey or interview questionnaires), list of documentary evidence. Other appropriate annexes could include: additional details on methodology, copy of the results chain, information about the evaluator(s).</p> <p><i>Note: Annexes should be maximum 60 pages long.</i></p> | Mostly | |

| Additional Information | | |
|---|-------------------------------|--|
| Identify aspects of <i>good practice</i> of the evaluation <i>Note: This section is to be populated by the QA Reviewer only, based on the overall Evaluation Report. No need to identify specific elements related to this section.</i> | N/A | |
| [Piloting] SECTION 9: DISABILITY INCLUSION (weight: 5%) <i>* The score for Section 9 will be 'bonus points' (5%), on top of the existing 100% weight.</i> <i>** Assessment is based on the UN Disability Inclusion (For further details, please refer to Technical Notes on Entity Accountability Framework).</i> | SCALE (No, Partially, Yes) | OVERALL ASSESSMENT for DISABILITY INCLUSION (Missing, Partial, Sufficient) |
| Does the evaluation include consideration of disability inclusion? | | Missing |
| 9.1 The evaluation questions include references to disability inclusion. | No | Qualitative Feedback (Please highlight any findings on disability inclusion): Disability inclusion was not included in the evaluation questions. The methodology does not contain references to the inclusion of people with disabilities and the topic was not covered in findings, conclusions or recommendations. |
| 9.2 The evaluation methodology includes references to disability inclusion. | No | |
| 9.3 The Evaluation findings, conclusions and/or recommendations contain references to disability inclusion. | No | |

PART III: THE OVERALL RATING

| Key Guiding Question | Total weighted score % | Overall Rating | Other reviewer's comments |
|--|------------------------|----------------|---|
| <p>Is this a credible report that addresses the evaluation purpose and objectives based on evidence, and that can therefore be used with confidence?</p> | <p>61.24</p> | <p>Fair</p> | <p>This evaluation report contains some gaps related to descriptions of the project, the results chain and the evaluation methodology. The report is not clearly written. The assessments in response to the evaluation questions are generally broad and should have been contained more clear, in-depth responses, substantiated by more detailed information on the activities/projects of and how they contributed to the expected results (which should have been described, particularly in the Effectiveness section). Conclusions and Recommendations sections are very summarized and also need more detailed information.</p> |